United Nations A/63/362

General Assembly

Distr.: General
18 September 2008

Original: English

**Sixty-third session**
Item 109 of the provisional agenda*
**Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit**

## Letter dated 15 September 2008 from the Permanent Representatives of Ireland and the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

We have the honour to refer to resolution 62/277, which the General Assembly adopted by consensus on 15 September 2008.

In that resolution, the General Assembly, inter alia, welcomed the report that we, as co-Chairs for system-wide coherence during the sixty-second session, provided to Member States on 21 July 2008 (see annex).

In the light of the foregoing, we request that you distribute the text of the present letter and its annex to Member States as a document of the General Assembly, under item 109 of the provisional agenda.

We would like to point out that an annex to the report of the co-Chairs has already been distributed to Member States as a document of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (A/63/85-E/2008/83).

(*Signed*) Paul **Kavanagh**
Permanent Representative
Ireland

(*Signed*) Augustine P. **Mahiga**
Permanent Representative
United Republic of Tanzania

* A/63/150 and Corr.1.

08-51149 (E) 201008

**Annex to the letter dated 15 September 2008 from the Permanent Representatives of Ireland and the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General**

# Report of the co-chairs on system-wide coherence

**Ambassador J.P. Kavanagh**
**Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations**

**Ambassador Augustine P. Mahiga**
**Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations**

**21 July 2008**

# Contents


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introduction and Overview | 4 |
| II. | Work of the Co-Chairs in the 62nd Session of the General Assembly | 6 |
| III. | 'Delivering as One' — Greater UN System Coherence at Country Level | 9 |
| | (i) The Co-Chairs' Visits to Countries which apply Coherence at Country Level | 10 |
| | (ii) Comparative Advantage of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies | 10 |
| | (iii) Perceptions in the General Assembly of Progress to Date | 11 |
| | (iv) The Situation of Middle Income Developing Countries | 15 |
| | (v) Monitoring and Evaluation | 16 |
| | (vi) 'Delivering as One' and the Harmonisation of Business Practices | 17 |
| IV. | Funding for Coherence at Global and Country Level | 18 |
| V. | Governance Aspects | 19 |
| | (i) Overview | 19 |
| | (ii) Relationship between the UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions | 21 |
| VI. | Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment | 22 |
| VII. | Environment, Humanitarian Assistance and Human Rights | 24 |
| | (i) Overview | 24 |
| | (ii) Environment | 24 |
| | (iii) Humanitarian Assistance | 24 |
| | (iv) Human Rights | 25 |
| VIII. | Conclusions/Recommendations | 26 |

## I. Introduction and Overview

1. In January 2008, the President of the 62nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly H.E. Dr. Srgjan Kerim appointed us as Co-Chairs for the Assembly's consultations on System-wide Coherence. These consultations had begun in the 61st Session under the distinguished stewardship of the Permanent Representatives of Barbados and Luxembourg, H.E. Ambassador Christopher F. Hackett and H.E. Ambassador Jean-Marc Hoscheit.

2. In appointing us to carry forward this process, the President underlined the importance of making concrete progress on System-wide Coherence during the current Session. He suggested that, through a series of consultations, the Co-Chairs should work towards an agreement on the modalities for implementing greater coherence across the United Nations development activities System. This would include making a thorough assessment of the progress made so far, in particular the implementation of the 'One United Nations' pilot projects, as well as obstacles encountered and opportunities for further implementation. The present report responds to the request of the President that we revert to him in mid-2008.

3. The Assembly's consultations on System-wide Coherence had gotten underway in 2007 as a response to the November 2006 Report of the High Level Panel (HLP)[1]. The landmark Panel Report, its many strong points notwithstanding, had received a mixed reception in the Assembly due not least to its timing and its context. It proved difficult for the Assembly to make headway during the 61st Session.

4. The move towards greater coherence and effectiveness across the United Nations System in fact long pre-dates the High Level Panel Report. A drive for greater coherence has been a feature of numerous, seminal resolutions of the General Assembly including the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Reviews (TCPRs) of 2001, 2004 and 2007. It is through the TCPR instrument that the Assembly has, by consensus, given overarching policy guidance to the development System of the United Nations. At the World Summit of 2005[2], the member States made clear once again by consensus at the highest levels of State and Government their commitment to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other internationally agreed development goals (IADGs). The Summit committed the membership to implementing operational reforms, aiming at a more effective, efficient, coherent, coordinated and better-performing United Nations System.

5. In other words, the effort towards greater coherence and effectiveness in the System did not begin with the High Level Panel. The latter's Report of November 2006 represents an important contribution to long-standing and continuing efforts in the Assembly to implement greater coherence across the System. With this in mind, it would not be an optimal follow-up, in our view, for each succeeding Session of the General Assembly to begin its work by exhaustively reviewing seriatim the current status of each and every recommendation contained in the High Level Panel Report. We would suggest, instead, that the Assembly, in this framework of System-wide Coherence, now take charge of the High Level Panel Report, select and address those areas of it which the broad membership wishes to pursue as a matter of priority, and set aside from these particular inter-governmental consultations those elements of the Panel Report which are already being vigorously addressed in other contexts. We believe that the consultations which we and our predecessors as Co-Chairs have undertaken may now facilitate the Assembly's reaching this point, by agreement, in the current Session.

6. In numerous developing countries we have undertaken consultations with the Heads of State and Government, Cabinet Ministers, Regional Presidents, Parliamentarians, Civil Society representatives and Development Partners etc. What we gleaned more than anything else from these exchanges is a great sense of urgency, immediacy even. Those whom we have met in developing countries and who are politically and managerially responsible for addressing serious and pressing challenges of economic and social development are eager, indeed impatient to have a United Nations Development System that is more efficient, more

[1] A/61/583 – Report of the High Level Panel on System-wide Coherence.
[2] A/RES/60/1 – 2005 World Summit Outcome.

coherent, and therefore, more effective in meeting the needs of their peoples, in line with their own national strategies.

7. By at least one significant index, the United Nations development System has, however, been in steady decline over a period of decades. Proportionately less and less development funding is being channelled through the UN System. In none of the many developing countries which we visited were the UN Country Team of Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies responsible for more than 5% or 6% of total Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) going into that country. Developing countries and their development partners alike know when a System is delivering well and when it needs to do much better. A more efficient, coherent and effective United Nations development System may arrest and reverse this historic trend. A UN System that fails to adapt further will have great difficulty doing so.

8. Nonetheless, following half a year of intensive consultations, the news we bring is, to a significant degree, good. The need for a more coherent and better performing UN System is increasingly recognised in the face of pressing global challenges, including climate change, communicable diseases, food insecurity, the effects and opportunities of globalisation, etc. Member States want to see a UN System that is strong, relevant, capable and integrated – one that preserves the highly valuable strengths assembled over decades and that builds on these. This positive vision for the future is widely shared across all regional groups of States.

9. Since the beginning of 2007, a concerted effort has been made on a voluntary basis by eight self-selecting 'pilot' developing countries in partnership with the UN System's Team of Representatives in those countries, to pioneer a new approach, 'Delivering as One' that will make the performance of the UN development System on the ground more efficient, more coherent and therefore more effective. These countries are Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

10. The 'Delivering as One' approach, despite remaining challenges, is making significant headway at country level. The developing countries concerned, which currently occupy quite different stages of development, are saying so loud and clear. A large and growing number of other developing countries are coming forward, for their own very good reasons, to embrace the new approach, even if there are no plans for formal designation of new 'pilot' countries as such. Some programme countries which begin a new UNDAF cycle this year have chosen voluntarily to implement aspects of 'Delivering as One'.

11. We have been told by many UN Agency Heads that the atmosphere in the Chief Executive's Board (CEB) of senior management across the System under the committed chairmanship of the Secretary-General has been transformed for the better over recent years. Far beyond the confines of System-wide Coherence, a more coherent and effective approach is increasingly in evidence. For example, in April, the CEB, within its own prerogatives, adopted a far-reaching package of steps to harmonise business practices across the UN System, in response to the 2007 consensus TCPR resolution of the General Assembly (A/RES/62/208). It is their commendable intention to carry forward expeditiously implementation of this long overdue package.

12. The present report will not stray into the overall discussion on global levels of Overseas Development Aid (ODA) since this matter is being addressed in a different facilitation process within the General Assembly with a view to the Doha meeting on Financing for Development that will take place in December 2008. Nevertheless, and having regard to the matter of funding for operational activities in the United Nations System, - in particular those being pursued in the framework of 'Delivering as One' – we believe that a meeting of minds can be reached in the Assembly during the current Session on significant aspects of Funding.

13. By the same token and while discussion will have to be enlarged and deepened in the coming, 63rd Session in light of emerging developments on the ground, we have been encouraged to believe that member States ought to be able to reach a meeting of minds on some aspects of Governance in the System-wide Coherence context.

14. Finally, as regards Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, - and emerging from open, transparent and inclusive discussions in informal plenary – we believe that with the dedicated assistance of the Deputy Secretary-General and her colleagues, it ought to be possible for the Assembly in the current, 62nd Session to make a conceptual breakthrough by pointing the direction it wishes to take in changing the institutional architecture of the UN System. The ultimate objective would be to improve delivery by the System of the many important and pressing mandates which member States together have conferred on it.

15. We will take up each of these areas in detail in the present report. While citing progress already achieved and in prospect, we will not downplay the many challenges which remain fully to be addressed. A closing section is entitled 'Conclusions and Recommendations'.

## II. Work of the Co-Chairs in the 62nd Session of the General Assembly

16. When taking up our task as Co-Chairs in January 2008, the General Assembly already had the benefits of the significant work which had been undertaken prior to our appointment, including the previous, comprehensive consultations chaired by the Ambassadors of Barbados and Luxembourg.

17. Over a period of many months during 2007, the Co-Chairs in the 61st Session arranged nine informal plenary consultations and briefings, open to the entire membership, to discuss the many and complex recommendations of the 2006 High Level Panel Report. These extensive consultations with the full membership gathered the recommendations of the Report under eight headings or general topics, viz. : a) 'Delivering as One' at country level; b) humanitarian issues and recovery; c) environment; d) gender; e) human rights; f) governance and institutional reform; h) funding; and i) business practices.

18. Our predecessors mapped the various issues raised in the Panel's Report and its recommendations as well as the views of the member States thereon. Due, however, to the great number and far-reaching nature of the Panel's recommendations, the General Assembly in its 61st Session was unable to reach an agreement, within the context of these consultations.

19. The President of the General Assembly asked us to continue consultations, during the 62nd Session of the Assembly in a more focussed manner, so that areas which the broad membership deemed to be important priorities might be identified and advanced. It was felt that the debate could be re-focussed and that the General Assembly might be able to move towards further agreement on the modalities for implementing coherence in the development activities system.

20. From the outset, we detected a broadly held view that it was in the interests of no concerned party, and, indeed, that it would be detrimental to the interests of the United Nations itself and of the peoples whom it serves, if the Assembly were to emerge at the end of a second successive Session of discussions without having given its own views. Important developments have been taking place on the ground. We have believed from the outset that the Assembly should be in a position to express itself and to exert its influence on these developments.

21. On 7 February 2008, in the first, informal plenary consultations of the 62nd Session, the broad membership accepted the overall approach which we, as Co-Chairs, proposed we should take to our work during the Session. This approach had been informed by our prior discussions with the Assembly President and we were gratified that it was straight away acceptable to the broad membership. In the intervening months we have consistently abided by this agreed approach whilst engaging fully with the membership throughout.

22. As Co-Chairs, therefore, we have taken an empirical, bottom-up and pragmatic approach to the subjects under discussion. The broad membership accepted that this path afforded the most feasible and practical way to move forward.

23. It was acknowledged from the outset that as a practical proposition it would be extremely difficult to seek to move ahead simultaneously on each and every aspect of the 2006 High Level Panel Report. The breadth, depth and not least the great number of recommendations contained in that Report led to this view, which was also sustained by any fair reading of the work of the previous Session of the Assembly.

24. At the same time, we were fully aware that there had been, amongst the member States, a widely shared reluctance to address the issues raised in the Panel's Report on a selective basis. There was a residual apprehension that such selectivity might respond exclusively or preponderantly to priorities which had been voiced from just one part of the membership.

25. Nonetheless, the broad membership shared our view that if the Assembly as a whole were to be able to agree on how to move the process forward, then our consultations would need to be focussed and targeted more tightly than on every single issue. It was acknowledged that we should point towards a middle-ground where the major concerns of member States were addressed in a balanced and fair manner. We underlined that there would be no fixed agendas, no a priori considerations and no faits accomplis in the course of our consultations. In this connection, we requested and were gratified to receive the trust of the broad membership.

26. As Co-Chairs, we undertook from the outset to focus on those areas which would be flagged to us in open informal plenary consultations as being of priority interest for broad areas of the membership. In this way, the report that we would ultimately present to the Assembly President would aim to sit well with all parts of the General Assembly Hall, since all areas of the membership would recognise many of their priority concerns in it.

27. We were, of course, aware that a significant number of member States were of the view that no decision could be reached by the Assembly concerning System-wide Coherence until all aspects of the High Level Panel Report had been comprehensively discussed and that only then could a single decision be made relating to the Panel Report in its entirety. Members holding this view at the same time signalled from the outset a degree of flexibility in their approach, in that they were prepared to revisit it in light of the ongoing consultations, which would proceed under our Co-Chairmanship.

28. Against this background and already at the first informal plenary consultations on 7 February, the broad membership enabled us to identify and announce the following main priority areas, drawn from the host of issues raised in the High Level Panel's Report:

- UN 'Delivering as One' at country level and the related area of Harmonisation of Business Practices;
- Funding;
- Governance; and
- Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

29. In any event, as Co-Chairs we were keen to bring squarely before the Assembly numerous and significant developments in regard to 'Delivering as One' which were already underway on the ground in a large number of developing countries. By the same token, we were anxious for the Assembly to be fully apprised of important progress in regard to Harmonisation of Business Practices, which the Secretary-General and his colleagues were achieving, within their own prerogatives, in the Chief Executives Board (CEB) of the System.

30. During the current, 62nd Session, the Assembly has, to date, had open informal plenary consultations, or briefings on System-wide Coherence as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Initial Consultation | 7 February |
| UN 'Delivering as One' | 28 March |
| Funding | 7 April |

| | |
|---|---|
| Briefing on Role of an Empowered Resident Coordinator | 17 April |
| Governance | 17 April |
| Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment | 16 May |
| Briefing on Business Practices Harmonisation | 13 June |
| Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (contd) | 16 June |

Thus, through the excellent work undertaken by our predecessors and the series of informal plenary consultations this year, the member States will have thoroughly reviewed all aspects of the 2006 High Level Panel Report.

31. In each of these informal plenary consultations we made opening and closing statements. The latter sought to draw the principal points from the discussion of the day. All of our statements were circulated at the time, by the President of the General Assembly, to the entire membership. They may be found on the Official website of the President of the 62nd Session of the General Assembly, H.E. Dr. Srgjan Kerim, (http://www.un.org/ga/president/62/issues/swc.shtml).

32. Throughout our tenure as Co-Chairs we have been entirely at the disposal of member States. In line with our open and transparent approach, we have consulted both in open informal plenary, bilateral and plurilateral consultations with the broad membership of the UN. We also consulted with the President of the General Assembly, H.E. Dr. Srgjan Kerim, H.E. the Deputy Secretary-General Migiro and the previous Co-Chairs. We visited seven of the eight pilot countries (Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam) and Malawi which is implementing the 'Delivering as One' reform without having been a designated a pilot. We visited, and were generously received by, Heads of United Nations Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies in New York, Paris, Rome, Vienna and Geneva to ascertain their views on the various aspects of System-wide Coherence and we have shared these views with the membership. We conferred with senior management at the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Washington D.C. We sought, as we hope this report will make clear, to provide the membership with as much information as possible about all the various developments in relation to System-wide Coherence so that any decision which they may wish to take on the matter would be on an informed basis.

33. Broad sections of the membership have consistently signalled to us that many of the recommendations contained in the 2006 Panel Report, specifically in the areas of Environment, Humanitarian Assistance and Human Rights were being addressed energetically in other related fora. Accordingly, these were not identified as necessitating in-depth discussion or action within the inter-governmental discussions on System-wide Coherence. The Co-Chairs share the view that it would be a mistaken approach to become entrenched in the structure and contents of the 2006 High Level Panel Report. Instead, the Panel Report should be dealt with pragmatically, not least because many of the issues are indeed being addressed in other fora.

34. The main body of the present report will address each of the four priority areas which have been consistently underlined by the broad membership, viz.

- UN 'Delivering as One' at country level and the related area of Harmonisation of Business Practices;
- Funding;
- Governance; and
- Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

35. The present report needs to be read in conjunction with the accompanying paper on Gender in its institutional dimension which is being provided to the Assembly President by the Deputy Secretary-General in response to the request of the member States that was agreed in open, informal plenary consultations on 16 June 2008. This report and the Deputy Secretary-General's paper, in combination, present a whole picture to the membership.

36. As indicated already, the present report will recommend that the Assembly during the current, 62nd Session select and act upon those priority areas which need specifically to be addressed in these continuing discussions on System-wide Coherence, whilst setting aside from these discussions other issues raised by the Panel and which are being pursued elsewhere.

## III. 'Delivering as One' – Greater UN System Coherence at Country Level

37. The centre piece of the High Level Panel's recommendations related to the work of the United Nations at country level, which had already been legislated by the General Assembly through various TCPR Resolutions. Those past decisions as well as the most recent TCPR (62/208) have led to a number of reforms including, inter alia, the widespread use of a single UN building and common services, the establishment and the improvement of the single United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and elements to improve the Resident Coordinator system etc. Before the High Level Panel Report, several countries had already taken the initiative to move ahead with reforms. Cape Verde for example had adopted a One Joint Office approach in January 2006, in response to the TCPR Resolution of 2004 (59/250) which called for the establishment of joint office models. Similarly, Vietnam's UN Country Team had already moved towards a single country programme, also on the basis of the TCPR Resolution of 2004 (59/250).

38. The High Level Panel sought to build on this and to address further the fragmented work of the UN at country level, by proposing that the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies of the United Nations further their collaboration and 'Deliver as One' in support of the national priorities of the national governments concerned. In order to achieve this, the Panel proposed a framework of four Ones: One Programme, which is focused on, and aligned with national priorities; One Leader, the Resident Coordinator who would lead an empowered country team; One Budgetary Framework which can provide funding for the One Programme; and, where appropriate, One Office where all the UN agencies can be located, to save money on operational costs and decrease other transaction costs. The One Office would also develop common services. As an increasing number of developing countries implement these four principles, they are tailoring them to their own needs. Some countries have added a 'fifth One' – Communicating as One, exhibiting once again that even in implementing 'Delivering as One' the principle of 'No One Size Fits All' is evident.

39. The Panel suggested that 'pilot' countries be designated to test this new method of work, to establish whether it would indeed result in stronger, better-performing United Nations on the ground. The countries which opted to act as pilots in coherence[3] began their work in January 2007. At the time of our appointment as Co-Chairs in January 2008 they had just completed a first year. Their primary focus in the initial year or so has been on putting in place the necessary structures and processes for implementation of this new approach, aligning the UN's development work with national frameworks and government priorities in each of the eight pilot countries. 2008 is the year of implementation and the UN Country Teams are working closely with their government counterparts to ensure that the 'Delivering as One' reform will live up to expectations. This approach is increasingly being applied by other developing countries which were not specifically designated pilots. Indeed, to varying degrees upwards of thirty developing countries are now implementing elements of this approach.

40. The new approach has brought significant and ground-breaking changes to traditional methods of work. It involved the agreement of One Programmes which were jointly prepared by the individual Governments concerned and the UN Country Teams. Drawing up these One Programmes involved taking the national priorities and identifying where the individual skill assets, knowledge and other resources of organisations, including non-resident agencies, in the UN system could best be brought to bear in supporting these priorities. It necessitated establishing One Funding mechanisms which pool additional extrabudgetary resources for the UN System at country-level to fund the unfunded gaps in the One Programmes. These mechanisms afford, for the first time ever to some of the Governments concerned, a comprehensive picture of the scope of assistance

[3] Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

provided to their countries by the UN System. This allows Governments to exercise national leadership in the identification of priorities for UN support. They also are decreasing fragmentation, duplication and internal competition for resources among UN Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies.

41. The reform also established, in the countries concerned, 'One Leader' for the UN family at country level in the form of the Resident Coordinator. This empowered leader leads an empowered country team. S/he has been authorised to negotiate the One Programme with the host government and to shape the related allocation of funding, while being subject to a clear accountability framework and effective oversight mechanism and with authority in turn to hold members of the UN Country Team accountable.

42. Finally, One Office arrangements, where appropriate, should bring the UN family together both physically in One Office space and virtually through the harmonisation of business practices such as communications, information technology as well as the harmonisation of common services. This should increase efficiencies, decrease transaction costs and produce savings which in turn should be spent on programmatic development work.

*i) The Co-Chairs' Visits to Countries which apply Coherence at Country Level*

43. As Co-Chairs and over a period of months, we have visited seven of the eight 'pilot' countries including Albania, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Viet Nam and Uruguay. We also visited Malawi, one of the first of many other countries which have embraced the 'Delivering as One' approach.

44. In each of the countries we visited, we normally conferred in detail with the Heads of State or Government, Minister for Foreign Affairs, coordinating Ministers and Ministers having line or sectoral responsibilities, as well as autonomous regional leaderships, parliamentary leaders, the Resident Coordinator and United Nations Country Teams, Development Partners and representatives of Civil Society, etc. The high level of engagement on the part of the host governments reflected a universal interest in the work of the Assembly concerning 'Delivering as One'.

45. We were repeatedly struck by the great sense of urgency on the part of political leaders and senior officials in these developing countries as they address their pressing development challenges. Frequently, we sensed a desire on their part that the General Assembly develop a similar sense in finding a way for the UN to deliver development assistance more efficiently, more coherently and more effectively.

*ii) Comparative Advantage of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies*

46. In the course of our Co-Chairmanship, we also visited Heads of Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies in Geneva, New York, Paris, Rome and Vienna. During our meetings the Agency Heads acknowledged a need for a consistent, positive message to be imparted by the various Headquarters in the System, at all levels, to country and regional representatives concerning the advancement of 'Delivering as One' and a One Programme effort that is aligned to the priorities of programme developing countries themselves in observance of the principle of national ownership. They also acknowledged that a new sense of momentum and collaboration is evident among the various parts of the UN System as the advantages of a more coherent, effective and efficient UN at country level become apparent. Indeed, they themselves have contributed to this sense of momentum.

47. We were keen to convey to Agency Heads the view of member States from the outset; that 'Delivering as One' cannot be about attempting to create 'One Single UN', but rather it must be about maintaining the diverse and vitally important capacities of the individual Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies while at the same time harnessing these capacities so that they can 'Deliver as One' in a more efficient, coordinated, coherent and effective manner. Indeed, the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies represent an enormous asset for the international community and are at the core of the UN's contribution to development

work. Any reform of the UN to make it more coherent must not sacrifice this wealth of diverse knowledge and expertise.

48. At the same time, the 'Delivering as One' approach will, ultimately, have implications and result in changes for the work of individual Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies on a country by country basis – where duplication is found, agreement will need to be reached to eliminate it. Similarly, where gaps are found, agreement will have to be reached on which Fund, Programme or Specialised Agency can most suitably fill these gaps. These are all aspects which will need to be addressed by concerned entities at headquarters level. The High Level Panel Report envisaged that there should be greater clarity as to what tasks should be carried out by which part of the UN System with consequent withdrawal from, or foregoing of activity in areas where no comparative advantage could be identified. This task would appear to be an essential part of 'Delivering as One' at country level and its implementation should continue to be rolled out at country level.

49. We were encouraged during our visits to Heads of the Fund, Programme and Specialised Agency to be told of the establishment of an Advisory Group of some thirteen agency Principals, supported by Assistant Secretaries-General. This inter-agency group which meets at Headquarters level has been established to assist in furthering coherence among the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies and in addressing and resolving any problems or challenges which present themselves in advancing the 'Delivering as One' process at country level.

50. During our exchanges with Heads of Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies in New York, Geneva, Rome, Paris and Vienna we were informed that the new, inter-agency Advisory Group had served as a useful mechanism to discuss and resolve issues in a collegial, informal and efficient manner. Many Heads of agency were greatly encouraged by the progress made among all stakeholders on establishing clarity of mandate and comparative advantage, as well as collaborating on mutual areas of interest and business practice harmonisation. While it is accepted that more work needs to be done in numerous other areas, including in strengthening the firewall (see below), many have reported a 'change of mindset' among the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies as the advantages and benefits of 'Delivering as One' are becoming clearer.

*iii) Perceptions in the General Assembly of Progress to Date*

51. On 28 March, 2008 in open informal plenary consultations, the Assembly took up consideration of the issue of 'Delivering as One'. At that meeting a number of member States outlined some of the concerns which they had at the time in relation to 'Delivering as One'. They insisted that the process must be voluntary and led by national governments. They would be opposed to any particular development model being forced upon member States. Any changes which were envisaged must be entirely voluntary. They also underlined that under no circumstances could they accept any new 'conditionalities' being attached to the delivery of development assistance. They underlined that changes underway must not simply deliver a better working method for the UN development System but it must deliver better development results for the countries concerned. Furthermore, many member States insisted that 'Delivering as One' must not simply be a cost-cutting exercise. Nevertheless, and despite these concerns, there was consensus among States that the 2007 TCPR resolution provides significant guidance for the way forward for the General Assembly as a whole in relation to the UN Development System's work. At the close of these open consultations, as Co-Chairs, we drew a number of conclusions including a factual observation that the Assembly was simply not prepared to accept, much less endorse, new 'conditionalities' for the delivery of aid through the UN Development System.

52. Also, during the 28 March open consultation, each of the eight pilots as well as several other developing countries which are applying the 'Delivering as One' approach took the floor and briefed the Assembly on their experience to date. Two months later, at the end of May, the pilots and other countries held an inter-governmental seminar hosted by the Government of Mozambique, in Maputo. The seminar took place in

accordance with paragraph 139 of the Assembly's consensus TCPR Resolution[4]. The participating developing countries adopted a Declaration giving their experience of the progress achieved to date in 'Delivering as One' as well as citing the challenges remaining. In this Maputo Declaration which has been circulated to UN member States in each of the six official languages of the United Nations the developing countries concerned formally request the General Assembly to encourage them in the path that they have voluntarily undertaken in embracing 'Delivering as One'. A copy of the Maputo Declaration is attached in Annex to the present report.

53. In brief, the declared experience of the developing countries directly concerned on the ground in implementing the 'Delivering as One' approach corresponds fully to the observations made by the Co-Chairs in their visits to these countries and in their engagement with the highest authorities there, as well as with the UN Country Teams, development partners and civil society. The same picture had emerged already in general terms in the Stocktaking Exercise regarding 'Delivering as One' which the Deputy Secretary-General undertook at the end of 2007. Progress so far on 'Delivering as One' is positive; it is in line with national priorities and development plans of the countries concerned; it has enhanced government-leadership and national-ownership; it is respecting the 'No One Size Fits All' principle and is being tailored to the specific needs of the countries concerned. The Maputo Declaration also indicates that the 'Delivering as One' process has led to increased availability of the UN System's mandates and expertise to meet national plans and priorities, including through increased involvement of the UN's non-resident agencies. The approach has led to decreased transaction costs for the governments concerned. Also in this context, progress has been achieved in promoting a more unified UN System approach to programming and funding its support to countries, through the One Programme and One Budget. One of the problems with the previously fragmented UN System was the internal competition for resources among the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies. Experience of the new paradigm points to a reduction in this competition as resources for the One Programme are managed in a transparent and effective manner through the One Budgetary Framework, with any gaps being funded through the One Fund, a pooled fund.

54. Nevertheless, it is clear that challenges remain in the way of full application of the 'Delivering as One'. Constraints remain in the way of full application of the 'Delivering as One' initiative. The Governments of developing countries concerned have outlined that the UN System at Headquarters levels needs to redouble its efforts to support the UN System representatives in the countries concerned in implementing the reforms. Headquarters levels need to support the empowered Resident Coordinator, accelerate harmonised business practices and adapt regulations which will accommodate this paradigm shift to a new, more coherent and effective method of working.

55. Among the main challenges arising from the One UN Programmes at country level is that of striking the right balance between, on the one hand an 'inclusive' approach that draws on all available and relevant UN System capacities and, on the other hand the need for strategic focus and prioritising of UN System activities. We believe that the principle of national ownership and leadership can be of decisive help in striking the coherent balance in a three way partnership involving the Governments concerned, the UN country team and the development partners.

56. Another issue highlighted to us was the need to include line or sectoral ministries more fully in the planning and decision-making processes in 'Delivering as One'.

57. Allocation of resources under the One Fund requires the Resident Coordinator to have ultimate authority where consensus in the UN Country Team cannot be reached. As it was put to us 'good people can disagree'.

[4] A/61/208.

The vesting of such authority, by agreement of all concerned, in the Resident Coordinator represents a significant change in the manner of allocation of funds. Furthermore, the One Fund requires that development partners provide unearmarked funding to the UN's activities at country level, which may be a change in their traditional methods of work too. Once again, here, the progress can be facilitated by aligning with national priorities and leadership in a three-way partnership.

58. A number of member States were concerned that the programmatic functions of UNDP country representatives be segregated more effectively from those which are performed in Resident Coordinator mode on behalf of the entire System. Progress is being made in the so-called 'firewall', but further progress is needed. In answer to concerns expressed by some member States, UNDP Representatives were able to offer a degree of reassurance as to the recruitment process for Resident Coordinators (not least regarding the number of non-UNDP appointees). At the same time, there remains a concern over the small proportion of appointees fro entities beyond the four core Boards comprising the so called "Ex Copm", viz. UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP. Here too, progress is being made but more is needed.

59. Joint Programming is at the core of 'Delivering as One' at country level. During our visits to the pilot countries it became evident to us that the main focus of the UN Country Teams' work in the first year of the pilot process was on designing and finalising these Programmes in close collaboration with the Government and other stakeholders. In most pilots the One Programme makes up a portion of the traditional UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) which latter reflects the total work of the UN System in-country; however Rwanda is an important exception among the pilots where the One Programme already makes up 100% of the UN's work there. The One Programme in Malawi (not a pilot per se) also makes up 100% of the UN's work in that country. Once again, we can observe differentiated and flexible application of the 'Delivering as One' approach in response to individual national circumstances and priorities.

60. The numerous advantages of the One Programme were outlined to us during our visits. It has increased UN Country Team partnership with the government and has aligned UN activities much more fully behind national priorities. The One Programme has reduced significantly the traditional burden and time on national administrations in developing countries caused by having to engage in a fragmented manner with a proliferation of UN entities. With national ownership as the starting point, we heard that developing countries themselves felt more empowered when dealing with a coherent UN Country Team than was the case with a fragmented System of powerful individual agencies which sometimes, in the past, had had the cumulative effect of overwhelming the State administrations concerned. The One Programme has also increased the involvement of non-resident agencies' expertise. Apart from the positive feedback from the pilot country Governments, UN Country Team members from right across the development System also told us that they had found the Joint Programming exercise beneficial as they now have a clearer picture of the areas of expertise that the other Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies bring to the UN Team.

61. As was acknowledged by the Governments concerned in the Maputo Declaration, any assessments made as of mid-2008 are interim in nature and a full picture of the benefits of, or challenges posed by 'Delivering as One' and One Programmes will only come once these One Programmes have been implemented to a much greater extent. We are half way through the second year, which is the first year of implementation. Nevertheless, the messages we are hearing are preponderantly positive.

62. Furthermore, it has been consistently been pointed out to us that for 'Delivering as One' to be successful there must be an empowered and able Resident Coordinator at the head of an empowered UN Country Team.

63. While all the pilots we visited had excellent Resident Coordinators and led Country Teams which were consistently hard-working, professional and committed to improving the UN's work in the country concerned, members of many Teams emphasised that the status quo relies too much on the personality of the Resident Coordinator and his/her colleagues. They noted that the role of the Resident Coordinator needs to be further institutionalised within the System, with the appropriate authority, resources and accountability framework. Codes of Conduct are being finalised at country level, but progress needs to be made in finalising a Code of

Conduct at global level to consolidate and strengthen the Resident Coordinator role. Dispute resolution mechanisms also need to be strengthened at headquarters level.

64. Guidelines have been developed at headquarters level with the UN Development Group (UNDG). These indicate that the Resident Coordinator has ultimate decision-making power on budgetary matters when consensus agreement on issues cannot be reached. As Co-Chairs, however, we have heard in the course of our consultations that this is not always adhered to at country level. It is important that Guidelines which empower the Resident Coordinator as the head of the UN country team are supported and implemented across the System in order to maintain coherence.

65. It is important indeed as a general proposition that the role of Resident Coordinator should be fully supported by the Headquarters of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies of the UN System. In our meetings with Heads of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies we were encouraged that some of our interlocutors are introducing support for 'Delivering as One' and enhancing coherence in the UN among the performance evaluation indicators for relevant officials, including their regional and country level representatives. This is a significant positive step towards encouraging and rewarding those representatives at country level who are working to make the UN more coherent.

66. Another recommendation of the 2006 High Level Panel Report was the establishment of One Budgetary Framework for the One Country Programme, reflecting all contributions, which would not constitute a legal constraint on the spending authority of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies. It recommended that the development partners should increasingly pool their funding contributions at the country or headquarters levels. In countries where there is a One Country Programme in place, the Panel enjoined the development partners increasingly to refrain from funding country-level interventions which are outside that country's One Programme.

67. Generally speaking, the One Budgetary Frameworks at country level are in the early stages of operation in the pilot and other countries which are applying the 'Delivering as One' approach. It has been reported by several of these countries that the new approach has already attracted new and additional resources from development partners in support of the One UN programme in-country. UN Country Teams in such countries have underlined that the One Fund, as a funding mechanism for the One Programme, has decreased the need for individual agency resource mobilisation and has decreased inter-agency competition. They point out that the One Fund will allow the UN Country Team and the Resident Coordinator to focus on programmatic work and make strategic choices for the use of funds. It is also expected that the One Budgetary Frameworks for a One Country Programme which is government-driven and in line with national priorities, by its very nature, can represent over time an attractive option that will continue to attract additional funding.

68. This has been echoed by the messages which we, as Co-Chairs, have heard from numerous development partners. These partners have indicated that they have committed funds to the One Programme, through the One Budgetary Framework, which are over and above their usual contributions to the UN System in a number of pilot and other countries. Some development partners are exploring with the national governments of concerned developing countries the possibility of including a section in their bilateral aid agreements providing support to the One UN Programme. This would ensure consistent, multi-year funding to these programmes. At the same time, and positive messages from some pilot and other countries notwithstanding, we have heard that other such countries have yet to attract adequate funding to sustain their One UN Programme. We have heard appeals, therefore, for those partners which support 'Delivering as One' to ensure that adequate and appropriate funding continues to be made available, so that this process is able to succeed.

69. There is a broad consensus among member States that the System-wide Coherence process should not be simply a 'cost-cutting' exercise. This has been underlined in the TCPR Resolution where member States called upon the United Nations Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies to ensure, to the extent possible, that savings resulting from reduction in transaction and overhead costs accrue to development programmes in programme countries. In this way as in others, 'Delivering as One' should deliver more.

70. The High Level Panel Report suggested that the reform savings should be channelled back into the System through mechanisms, such as an Empowerment Fund. As indicated elsewhere, there is in fact little or no appetite among member States for the creating of new inter-governmental mechanisms.

71. Member States have also generally expressed the view that savings would more usefully be redeployed into programmatic work in the country where the savings were made. This would provide direct gains for the country which had helped to realise the savings and could also provide a further incentive to reduce unnecessary and wasteful operational costs, for direct benefit to the development programme.

72. In our visits to the pilot Countries, as Co-Chairs, we were encouraged to see that savings generated through the implementation of 'Delivering as One' particularly the establishment of a One Office and related sharing of common services, have, in some cases, already been reinvested into programmatic work. This has occurred in Mozambique and Cape Verde. However, it has been pointed out to us that currently this practice is ad hoc and needs to be regularised and given structure. While there is recognition among the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies that the member States would wish such savings, where possible, to be reinvested in the country concerned the necessary changes in statutes, regulations and auditing practices have yet to be made to make this possible.

73. Work ought to be advanced among the UN Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies at the Headquarters level to allow the UN Country Team, in close coordination with the concerned government, to identify the best ways and means in which operational, and to the extent possible, administrative savings can be ploughed back into programme budgets in-country, so as to implement the requests outlined in TCPR paragraphs 104b and 114. The necessary flexibility should be shown to respond to the progress achievable under 'Delivering as One' as well as to provide an incentive towards greater effectiveness.

74. Finally, in countries where the One Office arrangements have been implemented significant savings have already been realised. The One Office in Cape Verde released resources which were spent on training UN staff and Cape Verdeans. In its first year of existence, the One Office in Praia cost 25% less than the total separate cost of the participating offices in the preceding year. Similarly, the One Office plans in Mozambique have resulted in significant cost savings. The plan to create the first carbon neutral Green 'One UN' Office in Hanoi, Viet Nam will result in significant savings in energy and other costs and is expected to set a benchmark as the most environmentally friendly office building in the ASEAN Region.

*iv) The Situation of Middle Income Developing Countries*

75. The 'Delivering as One' reform concerns the response of the United Nations System to rapidly evolving dynamics in the international development environment. The ways in which multilateral aid is delivered are undergoing important changes. If 'Delivering as One' is to realise its full potential it must continue first and foremost to recognise the particular needs of developing countries themselves and continue to be guided by the principle of national ownership and leadership. By way of joint programming, etc. it must continue to align the System's multilateral activities to the priorities, strategies, policies and plans of those countries - through a three-way partnership embracing the authorities of the programme developing countries concerned, the UN family of agencies and the development partners, viz. "donors".

76. About half of all United Nations member States are now middle-income developing countries. Although the High Level Panel Report of 2006 did not address the challenges which are specific to middle income countries (MICs), the General Assembly expressly recognised their needs in its consensus resolution 17 of December 2007 embodying the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR) which gives operational guidance to the broad United Nations Development System for the period 2008 through 2010. The current TCPR recognises in particular that middle-income countries still face significant challenges in the area of poverty eradication and that efforts to address these challenges should be supported in order to ensure that achievements made to date are sustained, including through support to the effective development of comprehensive co-operation policies.

77. Of the eight pilots, Albania is a middle income country that is strongly focussed on realising its national objective of progressive integration with the European Union. Cape Verde has graduated to middle income status in the past year or so, whilst Vietnam is hoping to do so in the coming year or two. Uruguay is a longstanding middle income country that in the mid-twentieth century had one of the best placed economies in the world. As indicated elsewhere, we were informed authoritatively by each of the four governments that the 'Delivering as One' process underway in their respective countries is respecting national ownership and leadership and is ensuring, to an unprecedented degree, alignment on the part of United Nations System development activities there with their own national priorities and plans.

78. We understand that the term "middle income country" was originally defined by the World Bank some three decades ago and was used to classify countries, based largely on Gross National Income (GNI), as part of the Bank's lending strategy. In our consultations with concerned States and other actors, we heard frequently about limitations on the usefulness and value of the term Middle Income Country in identifying and addressing the true development needs of such countries. These countries are often subject to critical vulnerabilities which affect their economies, institutions and societies at large. Many of them are particularly susceptible to dramatic external shocks from global and regional economic factors. While sometimes enjoying strong economic and social progress, they can be vulnerable also to sharp regression involving serious economic and social instability. Some of the middle income countries find themselves in such a state of vulnerability to external shocks that they regard themselves more as "borderline" countries.

79. In examining the challenges facing middle income countries further, the Co-Chairs noticed that middle income countries can be affected by high levels of poverty. For example, of the some 373 million inhabitants of South America – all of whose countries are in the middle income category – around 130 million are poor and of these in turn, approximately 89 million live in the five "upper middle income" countries of the continent, viz. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay and Venezuela. The term "middle income" can have inadequate regard to such realities whilst at the same time underestimating structural and institutional weaknesses and gaps in capacity.

80. Those middle income countries which have embraced the 'Delivering as One' approach are very often focused on sustaining their engagement with the UN System and the development partners so as to strengthen, through policy advice and other instruments, their national capacities to address the very real challenges mentioned above and many more besides. We detect a widely shared view among the membership that there is a need for the UN development System to address, in a more coherent and dedicated manner, the problems that affect middle income countries and to put in place the necessary conceptual clarity and organisational arrangements. These countries call for the UN system to promote South/South cooperation more.

81. A sizable proportion of the many countries which are voluntarily stepping forward to embrace the 'Delivering as One' approach to coherence are in the middle income category. Through continued adherence to the principle of national ownership and leadership, the 'Delivering as One' process overall will therefore bring to light in the years ahead important experiences and lessons for addressing more effectively the needs of such countries. Consequently, it may be valuable for the independent evaluation of 'Delivering as One' which the TCPR has anticipated for late 2009 to focus at some length on the lessons learned in respect of middle income countries.

*v) Monitoring and Evaluation*

82. The 2007 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR) Resolution of the General Assembly foresees two levels of evaluation:

a) an evaluation by the 'programme country pilots' of their own experiences. These countries would also exchange their experiences. The Secretary-General has been encouraged by the Assembly to support the pilots in all of this with the support of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG); and

b) in addition, the Assembly emphasises the need for an independent evaluation of lessons learned from the voluntary efforts to improve coherence, coordination and harmonisation in the United Nations development System, including at the request of some 'programme country pilots'. This independent evaluation will be for consideration by member States.

83. With regard to the first level of evaluation, (a) above, we met with representatives of the United Nations Evaluation Group(UNEG), in late May and were informed of the following. UNEG's work in this connection has concentrated on making sure that the necessary information systems, benchmarks and baselines are in place. To this end, it has undertaken a mission to the pilot countries and drawn up an 'evaluability report' on each one of them. These reports will be synthesised into a compilation report which will be posted on the UNEG website (http://www.uneval.org/) shortly. In the course of this exercise, UNEG was able to provide guidance to the governments of the countries concerned and to the UN Country Teams on the ground concerning monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. UNEG's guiding principles were that all monitoring and evaluation should take place in line with national priorities and be based on national monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, while adhering to the highest international standards.

84. The Maputo Declaration of 23 May 2008 issued by pilot and other countries which are applying the 'Delivering as One' approach underlines that the conduct of the first evaluation exercise at ( a) above, is an effort to be jointly overseen by the countries concerned and the United Nations System.

85. The second level of evaluation, the independent evaluation that would come to member States for consideration (b) above), will focus on lessons learned in the 'Delivering as One' efforts overall. This is an exercise that can hardly reach completion before the end of 2009. One could imagine that an assessment of the processes involved might be achieved by then, but that it would take more time to evaluate definitively the development outcome of the 'Delivering as One' approach.

86. During the informal plenary consultations on 'Delivering as One' many member States stressed the need for the independent evaluation of 'Delivering as One' to be assuredly independent. Member States have also made clear that the 'Delivering as One' process should result in improved delivery of development assistance to the country concerned. It was stated that any final evaluation must address development results in order to provide a clear picture of the 'Delivering as One' reform and its effects on the development process in-country. It was also stated that any evaluation or change at central level should not interfere or restrain the ability and sovereignty of national governments to undertake development work, in line with their national priorities.

87. For our part as Co-Chairs, we have expressed the view that if member States in the General Assembly are to sign off on the future independent evaluation of 'Delivering as One' that is foreseen in the TCPR, then the Assembly will as a practical matter need to be content, going forward, with the methodology and conduct of this evaluation. For this reason, we would suggest that early in the 63rd Session, the membership receive a first briefing in open informal plenary consultations on what is contemplated in that regard.

88. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) too has taken an interest in these matters.

*vi) 'Delivering as One' and the Harmonisation of Business Practices*

89. At central level the work of harmonising the business practices of the UN System has been ongoing for many years in various fora. In the context of the Chief Executives Board (CEB), under the Chairmanship of the Secretary-General, these matters are assigned to the High Level Committee on Management (HLCM). This Committee leads the work in implementing the requirements of the General Assembly, through the Fifth Committee and other bodies, to harmonise business practices across the system. It is currently chaired by Ms. Thoraya Obaid, Executive Director of UNFPA.

90. In April 2008 the CEB approved, within its own prerogatives, an extensive package of measures designed to harmonise business practices across the System. The package had been elaborated and agreed,

System-wide in the High Level Committee on Management (HLCM). The package of measures is of an inter-disciplinary nature and covers all major management functions of United Nations System organizations including human resources, procurement, information & communication technology, finance and budget. The package would evolve to include projects that have not yet been developed, such as the creation of an independent System-wide capacity for evaluation and initiatives in the area of legal affairs. The aim of CEB members is to have some of the measures accomplished within nine months, with the most complex ones taking two to three years for completion.

91. In order to apprise the entire membership of the exact nature of the projects proposed we arranged for an open briefing session to take place on 13 June. Ms Obaid, as Chairwoman of the HLCM gave the briefing and was supported by Mr Adnan Amin, Director of the CEB. They provided a detailed written and oral explanation of the various aspects of the package. The General Assembly would benefit from further briefings from time to time on such aspects of the work of the CEB.

## IV. Funding for Coherence at Global and Country Level

92. The 2006 High Level Panel Report recognised the need for increased and improved funding for the United Nations both at country and global level. Specifically, the Panel was of the view that "inadequate and unpredictable funding of the System also contributes to fragmentation, undermining the multilateral character of the United Nations. The exponential growth of extra-budgetary (non-core) versus core resources has encouraged supply-driven rather than demand-driven approaches to assistance, undermining the principle of country ownership. Lack of donor coordination and competition for non-core resources among United Nations agencies squander significant time and effort on fund-raising, undermining the ability of the United Nations to make long-term strategic decisions that would deliver more effective results.'

93. The General Assembly for its part, has recognised this in the TCPR Resolution of 2004 and again in the TCPR Resolution of December 2007. In a key consensus paragraph that brings together a number of crucial concepts, the latter 'emphasises that increasing financial contributions to the United Nations Development System is key to achieving the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, and in this regard recognizes the mutually reinforcing links between increased effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of the United Nations Development System, achieving concrete results in assisting developing countries to eradicate poverty and achieve sustained economic growth and sustainable development through operational activities for development and the overall resourcing of the United Nations Development System'.

94. This consensus position of the Assembly formed an important part of the context to our work as Co-Chairs. With the agreement of the broad membership we have not strayed into the macro-level debate concerning global spending on Overseas Development Assistance (ODA). This is being addressed in a separate, if parallel facilitation exercise in the Assembly under the leadership of the distinguished Permanent Representatives of Egypt and Norway. Essentially, for our part, we have focused on the Funding-related elements of the 2006 Panel Report.

95. The view in general among States is that sufficient, timely and predictable funding at the country level must be mirrored by sufficient, timely and predictable funding at global level. As the TCPR stressed, core resources, because of their untied nature, continue to be the bedrock of the operational activities for development of the United Nations System. It is of great concern to the broad membership that the share of core contributions to the UN Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies has declined in recent years. In all our consultations it has been clearly pointed out to us that core funding is essential to sustain the continued basic capacity of the UN System. Furthermore, increases in core funding must complement adequate funding of the UN's work at country level. There is a natural and understandable concern among Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies that funding of 'Delivering as One' must not be at the expense of core at global level.

If we are to build a UN which is strong, flexible and efficient we need to ensure that it is adequately resourced, both at central level and at country level.

96. The 2007 consensus TCPR resolution urged the development partners and other countries in a position to do so to increase substantially their voluntary contributions to the core/regular budgets of the UN development system, in particular its Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies, and to contribute on a multi-year basis, in a sustained and predictable manner. At our open informal plenary consultations on 7 April, member States stressed the need for the fulfilment of all commitments in relation to funding of the UN System, including the need to address the current imbalance between core and non-core funding. While increased core funding can incentivise commitment to greater coherence, the UN System and development partners must ensure that there is neither the appearance nor reality of a pattern of funding which suggests that those developing countries which do not choose to participate in 'Delivering as One' are deliberately disadvantaged as a consequence. In this, as in other respects we are unable to visualise the Assembly countenancing arrangements which may be seen as amounting to 'new conditionalities' over the delivery of assistance through the United Nations Development System.

97. The High Level Panel also noted that the assessed contributions for the Specialised Agencies have not increased in years, which has left them having to rely on voluntary funding for core activities. This matter was also raised at our consultations on Funding where numerous member States supported a review of the assessed funding of the Specialised Agencies to enable them to continue their work on global norms and standards. They called for an assessment of whether the current policy of zero real growth is adequate. It would seem therefore important, if there is to be real incentive for the participation of all parts of the UN System in greater coherence, that this policy be re-examined in light of encouraging greater commitment to coherence and less reliance upon voluntary funding.

98. The 2006 Panel also recommended establishing a Millennium Development Goal Funding Mechanism, which would coordinate overall resource flows, enabling global oversight of funding available for contributions to the One Country Programme. However, in our consultations member States have generally felt that there was a lack of clarity concerning the need for such a fund and its specific implications. They were keen to stress that any new funding mechanisms should focus on funding all aspects of work that the UN is mandated to do, not simply the work relating to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Let us recall once again that in line with the general views expressed, the membership are also keen to avoid the establishment of any new, overarching and additional mechanisms as these could risk simply adding new layers of process.

99. The membership may wish to declare anew much of the foregoing and continue consideration of the important issue of Funding, particularly in light of the outcome of the meetings of the Assembly related to the Millennium Development Goals scheduled for September, 2008.

## V. Governance Aspects

### *i) Overview*

100. The 2006 High Level Panel maintained that 'effective governance is at the core of coherence.' Improved Governance structures are central to the improved efficiency, coherence and effectiveness of the UN System. This is important at both the country level, where an empowered Resident Coordinator, at the head of an empowered UN Country Team, is critical to the Team's success, as well as at Headquarters level where existing governance and decision-making processes can be improved and may need to be adapted to deal with the new One Programmes which emerge from 'Delivering as One'.

101. Many member States have expressed concern at the short-term feasibility of the recommendations of the High Level Panel Report on Governance. In particular, many member States made the point that the specific

changes envisaged by the Panel would have substantial implications for existing governing bodies and ECOSOC and would need careful consideration.

102. Many States felt it of crucial importance that the work at country level, which is government-led and aligned with national priorities should in no way be hindered by changes at central or headquarters level. Any changes at headquarters level should, on the contrary, enhance the UN development System's ability to support the developing countries in implementing their national priorities and assuring greater effectiveness in the delivery of UN programmes. Any changes at headquarters level must also be flexible, and accord with the reality that 'No One Size Fits all'.

103. Any approach that sought to design a new System of inter-governmental governance from the top-down would be unlikely to prosper. At the same time, an emerging new approach, embodying 'Delivering as One' at country level is being applied by a large and growing numbers of developing countries. Bottom-up, this process creates a need for suitably adapted headquarters and regional arrangements to which an emerging new paradigm at country level can relate and align.

104. It appears to us essential that an appropriate balance is to be struck between providing adequate intergovernmental oversight of the System's development priorities and objectives, while respecting the voluntary, nationally-led nature of the coherence process and the respective mandates of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies.

105. At central level, member States felt that the implementation of some of the recommendations of the 2006 Panel Report could result in duplication, given that the strengthened ECOSOC has established both the Annual Ministerial Review and the Development Cooperation Forum as high level fora for strategic guidance on sustainable development.

106. Specifically, while it is clear that the new and emerging 'One Programmes' will need to be dealt with effectively and efficiently at global level, the Panel's proposal for creating a Sustainable Development Board was felt by many to be duplicative. It received little or no support. While the current arrangement, which sees One Country Programmes being tediously dismantled into their constituent parts and approved separately by the various Boards of the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies is far from optimal, there was little support for the creation of a Sustainable Development Board to fill this role. Many member States felt that it could be more useful to adapt existing structures such as ECOSOC, perhaps in coordination segment or in the operational segment. The Annual Ministerial Review could provide an opportunity to discuss the progress in 'Delivering as One'. These options need to be discussed and explored in more detail by member States as the reality of the 'Delivering as One' programmes becomes evident.

107. Since the 2005 World Summit Outcome, work has been undertaken to strengthen ECOSOC, to enhance its capacity as the main policy-making body of the UN for economic and social development issues. The 2007 TCPR resolution also requested that the Secretary-General report on an annual basis to the ECOSOC on numerous aspects which relate to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the UN. It requested that the Secretary-General report on the functioning, selection and training process of the Resident Coordinator system. It requested the executive boards and governing bodies of the United Nations Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies to assess the progress achieved including costs and benefits, in the area of simplification and harmonisation of United Nations development system at the global, regional and country levels. The governing bodies were also requested to analyse the potential impacts on development programming and report to ECOSOC on an annual basis.

108. At this year's substantive meeting of ECOSOC, the Maputo Declaration was presented to the member States at a side event hosted by the Government of Mozambique and was acknowledged in the resolution adopted by ECOSOC on the operational segment.

109. The work of the United Nations at regional level was not the subject of extensive discussion during our consultations on Governance. However, during our visits to developing countries, it was made clear to us that there is a need to clarify the role of regional level management and to encourage the latter to provide more support to the UN Country Teams on the ground as these advance a more coherent and more effective approach. It was felt that regional presences of the UN need to be streamlined and harmonised so that they can be utilised to their full advantage.

110. At the CEB meeting in late October the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) was officially incorporated into the Chief Executives Board. This group, which is chaired by the Development Coordinator, serves as the central coordinating mechanism for the United Nations operational work in development. It fulfils many of the roles envisaged by the Development Policy and Operations Group.

111. At its meeting in April 2008, the CEB incorporated into its structures a thirteen member Advisory Group at the level of Principals and Assistant Secretaries-General. This group has emerged from the much closer collaboration among Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies at Headquarters levels that had been necessitated by the evolving 'Delivering as One' arrangements at country level.

*ii) Relationship between the UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions*

112. There is broad consensus among member States that increased collaboration and coordination is needed between the United Nations System and the Bretton Woods Institutions. The High Level Panel Report of 2006 included this in its recommendations. The General Assembly called for this in its Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review (TCPR), 2007. The Assembly invited the United Nations System and the Bretton Woods Institutions to explore further ways to enhance cooperation, collaboration and coordination including through greater harmonisation of strategic frameworks, instruments, modalities and partnership arrangements, in full accordance with the priorities of the recipient Governments.

113. As Co-Chairs we visited the senior management of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Washington D.C. in June 2008. At the World Bank we conferred with Ms Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director, while at the IMF we met with Mr Murilo Portugal, Deputy Managing Director. Both representatives were expressly supportive of further collaboration with the United Nations System both at country level and at global level, provided this is well-conceived, pragmatic and results-oriented.

114. Increased coherence, enhanced effectiveness and coordination, the elimination of duplication and overlap and alignment with national priorities are already important for all actors in development at country level, including the United Nations. Greater coherence and effectiveness on the part of the United Nations Development System will, in our assessment and on the basis of what we have heard, inevitably presage much closer collaboration and complementarity between the work of the System and that of the Bretton Woods Institutions. Furthermore, a more coherent and effective United Nations System can provide leadership among other development actors and be a more valuable partner for governments in advocating and leveraging additional resources to meet their national priorities. Mozambique cited to us its own positive experience in this regard.

115. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (where they are represented on the ground) are normally members of the UN Country Teams in all programme countries, even if they are less centrally engaged than the UN Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies. In the course of our visits to pilot countries we were struck in particular at the increased collaboration between the UN System's Country Team and the World Bank representative in Albania. There the Bank Representative, while promoting the Bank's own priorities, was described as a 'key member' of the UN Country Team. The Bank and the UN are working together with the Government of Albania on numerous projects in that country. While we did not see widespread, increased collaboration in the other countries we visited, in many places members of the UN Country Team pointed to the potential which exists in this direction as the 'Delivering as One' process develops further. In Tanzania there has been discussion about the World Bank representative having access to the One

Office of the UN Country Team on a cost-sharing basis. Some of the UN agencies already have highly developed country and regional level collaboration with the Bank, in particular. The Bretton Woods Institutions naturally tend to embrace the UN System expertise and experience, the more that peace, security and stability considerations come into play. As Co-Chairs, we understand that the United Nations and World Bank are developing partnership documents, designed to institutionalize principles of collaboration, consolidate gains and further strengthen the relationship in a number of critical areas. These documents include a UN-World Bank partnership framework on crisis and post crisis collaboration, a UNDG-World Bank operational partnership note, and a UNDG-World Bank fiduciary framework.

116. We look forward to more progress in this regard and hope that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund will encourage their representatives at country level to engage even more with an evolving UN Development System, where this is likely to avert overlaps, increase synergies and – most importantly - benefit the developing countries concerned.

117. There is also broad acknowledgement that there should be increased collaboration between the Bretton Woods Institutions and the United Nations System at global level. Such increased collaboration is already being furthered in various different settings, including at the Chief Executives Board level (CEB). As one example, the CEB has recently established the Secretary-General's Task Force on Food Security to address the global food crisis. It brings together the relevant entities in the UN System with the full and active participation of the Bank and the Fund and the personal engagement of their leadership.

118. The relationship between the UN System and the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund will also be discussed at the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus which will be held in Doha, Qatar, from 29 November to 2 December 2008. Consequently, this overarching relationship is being addressed in the General Assembly facilitation which is chaired by the distinguished representatives of Egypt and Norway. These are all important and ongoing areas of increased collaboration with the Bretton Woods Institutions, although they are not necessarily directly related to the increased collaboration in the context of 'Delivering as One'.

119. Our approach as Co-Chairs on System-wide Coherence has all along been a pragmatic and 'bottom-up' one. We have eschewed any 'top-down' approach that might, for example, in this instance seek ab initio to re-draw institutional structures or significant inter-institutional relationships. However, desirable this may be, it hardly seems a practicable proposition at this time.

120. It will be clear, however, that there is considerable potential for closer engagement between the United Nations System and the Bretton Woods Institutions. Without doubt, there is a willingness on the part of the Bank and the Fund to engage on this basis more closely with the United Nations System in the field of development. During the 63rd Session of the General Assembly, it could be valuable to explore with the Bretton Woods Institutions the potential in this direction in a pragmatic and results-oriented manner. The more pragmatic and results-oriented such efforts are, the more likely they will be to register progress. It is essential that greater operational coherence and collaboration between an evolving United Nations Development System and the Bretton Woods Institutions should be appropriately and indeed, optimally linked up with the policy coherence being pursued at global level.

## VI. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

121. From the outset, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment has been highlighted to us as Co-Chairs by member States from all regions as an issue of priority importance. It is an issue of high significance for all States. While it has central relevance to the UN's work in the field of development, it has much broader scope and impact – not least in the normative area – for all States, regardless of their stage of development. No member State of the United Nations can boast that it has fulfilled all of the agreed international targets and,

therefore its own internationally-given commitments in regard to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

122. At open informal plenary consultations held on 16 May 2008, a consensus among member States recognised the strong normative acquis of the United Nations System in relation to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. This is based, inter alia, on the United Nations Charter, Resolutions of the General Assembly, of ECOSOC and of the Security Council as well as the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the Outcome Document for the Cairo Conference on Population and Development and the Convention on the Elimination of the Discrimination against Women. However, it was made equally clear by States and by the relevant parts of the United Nations System itself, that within the System there are gaps in coherence, authority, accountability and resources in addressing this important area and not least in assisting States to bridge the space between their international commitments and national performance in this area.

123. In order to get a clearer picture of the nature and extent of the gaps and overlaps in this key area of the System's work, the membership as a whole on 16 May requested that we ask the Secretary-General for a paper which would take account of the many views expressed by the member States and help them to pursue discussion on the substantive, programmatic aspects of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. This request was conveyed to the Secretary-General by the President of the General Assembly. In response, the Secretariat supplied a paper for the membership on 6 June. This brought into focus a shared analysis of the current situation as to the System's delivery on its many mandates in the area of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. It emerged from a collaborative exercise by various entities in the System under the leadership of the Deputy Secretary-General. It addressed the normative and operational aspects of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and the linkages between them. It reflected the strong sense among member States that the System suffered from important gaps in the areas of coordination and coherence, authority and positioning, accountability and human and financial resources. The paper formed a useful basis for a further discussion among the membership which took place on 16 June in the General Assembly.

124. In the informal plenary consultations of the Assembly held on 16 June, there was an unmistakeable and broad-based momentum to address further the manifest weaknesses of the United Nations System in relation to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. In light of this second, lengthy exchange of views and in order to facilitate further progress on how to improve and strengthen the institutional dimension of Gender, the broad membership agreed that we should request from the Secretary-General a further paper. This would present in a non-prescriptive manner a range of institutional options on how best to re-organise the Gender-related bodies in the System so that these might perform and deliver much more effectively than they do at present. As Co-Chairs, we specifically asked that this, further paper provide a comprehensive and comparative assessment of each of the institutional options it might posit and of their implications. It would need to take into account the questions and concerns raised by member States. It would help to give further focus to the Assembly's continuing discussions. Once again, this desire on the membership's part was conveyed to the Secretary-General by the President of the Assembly. It is anticipated that the institutional options paper will be in the hands of the member States at the same time as the present report, in the penultimate week of July.

125. The Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment aspect of System-wide Coherence has broad and indeed universal relevance to all member States. It is important to the matter of development, but it goes far beyond development in its scope. Generally speaking, the broad membership has been keen for the Assembly – before it enters decision-making mode in this, 62nd Session – to consider the issue of Gender alongside others which were highlighted by the 2006 High Level Panel Report.

126. The institutional options paper being provided by the Secretary-General, taken together with the present report, should complete the substantive picture for member States. With both these elements in hand, member States will be in a position to consider, in an intensive and expeditious manner and as from late August/early September, how the Assembly may wish to move forward, in the current 62nd Session, on this issue of universal importance.

## VII. Environment, Humanitarian Assistance and Human Rights

*i) Overview*

127. The 2006 High Level Panel Report included a large number of recommendations in the areas of humanitarian assistance, the environment and human rights - each of which is of central importance to the work of the United Nations as a whole.

128. At the same time, in our consultations with member States and other stakeholders we found little appetite or interest in prioritising specifically within these inter-governmental consultations on System-wide Coherence the issues of environment, humanitarian assistance and human rights. This is because some of the Panel's recommendations are being followed up in other contexts and fora, whilst others (not least some in the humanitarian area) are effectively implemented. Moreover, it is clear to us as Co-Chairs that in refraining from prioritising particular issues in the System-wide Coherence context, some interested member States have sensed that the present framework may not be the most propitious or fruitful one in which to ventilate and seek for progress on the issues concerned.

129. In light of the considerations set out here, in order to facilitate a sharper focus on a number of priority issues and to avoid duplication and misdirection of effort, the Assembly appears ready definitively to set aside from this particular strand of inter-governmental consultations, viz. System-wide Coherence, the issues of environment/ environmental governance, humanitarian assistance and human rights. Naturally, all agreed mandates and programmes concerning the environment, humanitarian assistance and human rights remain fully in place and strong efforts will continue to have these faithfully implemented by all concerned.

*ii) Environment*

130. The High Level Panel recommended that issues concerning the environment, which is one of the pillars of sustainable development, should be streamlined and made more coherent. Its recommendations on the environment are largely being addressed in the context of the ongoing consultations on International Environmental Governance (IEG), under the Co-Chairmanship of the distinguished Permanent Representatives of Mexico and Switzerland, as well as in other active fora. A preponderant view among member States is that environment related aspects of the Panel's Report should for the most part continue to be discussed in the context of the IEG consultations and elsewhere. While, as Co-Chairs on System-wide Coherence consultations, we have not entered into detail on the environmental aspects of the Panel's report, this should not be taken to imply a view that environment-related work being carried out at country level should be excluded from the 'Delivering as One' process or from efforts at enhanced coherence. It is simply the case that no appetite is detectable among member States to pursue the Environment in the inter-governmental consultations on System-wide Coherence which we currently chair.

*iii) Humanitarian Assistance*

131. Similarly, there have also been recent reforms in the area of humanitarian and recovery work of the United Nations. The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) reports that real progress has already been made in the implementation of the recommendations in the High Level Panel Report on humanitarian issues and recovery. This represents progress towards ensuring that there is one overall strategic framework for humanitarian response in a given country, in support of national efforts, as well as one agreed country-level monitoring and evaluation system.

132. The aim of these reforms is to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of humanitarian programmes. Since 2006 the United Nations has launched a series of initiatives aiming to enhance the coordination of emergency humanitarian response. These have focussed on four areas: capacity and coordination at country level; leadership; partnerships; and predictable and equitable humanitarian financing.

Strengthening the leadership at country level has also been addressed with various initiatives to buttress the humanitarian coordinator role.

133. To strengthen partnerships and address the fragmentation highlighted in the Panel Report, the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) brings together United Nations and non-United Nations humanitarian organizations. The aim is to enhance the effectiveness and coordination of humanitarian assistance and to strengthen the capacity of local non-governmental organisations.

134. In relation to funding, the speed, equity, effectiveness and predictability of financial resources for humanitarian assistance have all been improved through the establishment of several funding mechanisms. These include 'pooled funds' such as the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) at the global level, which has 2008 pledges amounting to some $ 431.3 million, of which $414 million has been contributed as of mid-July. Other 'pooled funds' include the Common Humanitarian Funds (CHF) and the Emergency Response Funds (ERF) at country level. Complemented with a stronger consolidated and flash appeal process (CAP) that allows for the identification and prioritisation of humanitarian needs by all stakeholders, these funding mechanisms have been reported as being highly effective in facilitating rapid and needs-based humanitarian response.

135. As Co-Chairs, we are encouraged by the progress which has been and continues to be made in the Humanitarian area. Informed by our extensive consultations with the membership and given the progress which has been achieved on foot of the 2006 Panel's recommendations, our impression of the general view among member States is that the area of humanitarian assistance does not need to be pursued specifically in the context of System-wide Coherence. No doubt, in other contexts, the General Assembly would benefit from ongoing briefings and updates on progress that continues to be made in this regard.

*(v) Human Rights*

136. At the 2005 World Summit, Heads of State and Government affirmed strongly that peace and security, development and human rights are the three principal pillars of the United Nations System. In line with this recognition, in recent years significant work has been undertaken to strengthen the United Nations Human Rights System, including through the establishment of the Human Rights Council (HRC), even as the Third Committee of the General Assembly and other inter-governmental bodies continue to discharge their important functions.

137. The United Nations human rights architecture is comprehensive, encompassing the UN Charter-based organs and bodies, including the General Assembly, ECOSOC and, to a limited but growing degree, the Security Council as well as the Secretary-General and the Court. Here we must also include the Human Rights Council and the International Human Rights Treaty bodies made up of independent experts mandated to monitor States parties' compliance with their Treaty obligations, as well as the international tribunals and, of course, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights which provides leadership to the United Nations human rights efforts and provides technical assistance and other capacity building to member States and regional bodies in implementing human rights provisions and commitments.

138. The Human Rights Council, which was established in 2006, is mandated by the Assembly to 'undertake a Universal Periodic Review, based on objective and reliable information, of the fulfilment by each member State of its human rights obligations and commitments in a manner which ensures universality of coverage and equal treatment with respect to all States'. This review, which reviews all countries, initially every four years, is intended to assist States in the fulfilment of their human rights obligations and commitments, assessing both the positive developments and the challenges faced. This augments the existing mechanisms of the International Human Rights Treaty Bodies, which examine the States' reports on implementation of the various human rights Treaties which they have ratified. In addition to the Universal Periodic Review of the Human Rights Council and the Treaty Bodies, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

provides technical assistance and other capacity-building to member States on mainstreaming and strengthening the promotion and protection of human rights.

139. In the course of our consultations with the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies, we met with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva. They informed us of the many and detailed developments which have taken place in recent years in partnership with member States and the UN System to enhance and mainstream the promotion and protection of human rights.

140. As well as assisting the Human Rights Council and the Treaty bodies over the years, the Office has increased its presence at country and regional level in various ways. The number of its country offices has grown to eleven. In these countries and with the agreement of the governments concerned, the Office provides technical assistance, monitoring and reporting, as well as capacity development in addressing human rights issues. The OHCHR has also strengthened its regional offices, which play a crucial role in supporting human rights work in their respective regions and work closely with regional human rights bodies. Finally, the OHCHR has deployed numerous Human Rights Advisers to support UN Country Teams. These advisers assist the UN Resident Coordinator and the UN Country Team to work on strategies to build or strengthen the nation's capacities and institutions in promoting and protecting human rights. Mainstreaming of human rights is already underway in the broad area of development. The preambular part of the 2007 TCPR resolution of the General Assembly is relevant here.

141. These mechanisms continue to strengthen the promotion and protection of all human rights in all categories of member States. It seems clear to us as Co-Chairs that, in order to avoid duplication and overlap and to avoid pursuing issues in channels that are likely to prove fruitless, the broad membership has formed the general view that consideration of this work should continue to be taken up in these various settings and not within the framework of the continued discussions on System-wide Coherence.

## VIII. Conclusions/Recommendations

142. As the Co-Chairs for System-wide Coherence in the 62nd Session of the General Assembly we have sought to conduct an open, transparent, balanced and inclusive process of consultations among the entire membership. Our aim has been to present a report that by and large, will sit well with all parts of the Assembly in that all groupings of States should be able to feel that the report addresses seriously many of their principal priorities and concerns. In this way we have sought to facilitate a balanced and fair, compromise outcome to the Assembly's deliberations during the current Session.

143. The following Conclusions/ Recommendations flow from the present report overall, but are perhaps best seen in tandem with the Introductory section. The landmark 2006 High Level Panel Report, while a very important contribution to the work of the General Assembly to increase coherence across the UN System, did not launch that work. The Millennium Summit and the World Summit of 2005 as well as consensus positions of the Assembly, not least the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Reviews (TCPRs), constitute much of the bedrock for building further progress in this area.

144. Since the outset of the current, 62nd Session, the broad membership has signalled that the continuing efforts on System-wide Coherence should focus on four priority areas, viz.

i) UN 'Delivering as One' at country level with the related aspect of Harmonisation of Business Practices
ii) Funding

iii) Governance
iv) Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

145. The present report should be taken together with the paper on Gender (in its institutional dimension) which is being provided by the Secretary-General in these days to member States in response to their agreed request of 16 June.

146. As for 'Delivering as One', we have sought to provide the member States with an accurate and up to date picture of the process as it is actually developing on the ground in upwards of thirty developing countries and not simply as it is perceived from afar. We have been helped in this by our on-the-ground consultations with Heads of State and Government, Cabinet Ministers, Parliamentarians, UN Country Teams, Development Partners, etc. in some eight developing countries. We have conferred at length also with UN agency Heads in New York Geneva, Rome, Paris and Vienna. We have taken careful note of the Maputo Declaration issued in May by pilot and other developing countries in which they formally request the Assembly to encourage them in the 'Delivering as One' approach that they have voluntarily embraced in partnership with the UN System.

147. Our conclusion is that the experience of 'Delivering as One' to date (i.e. half way through its second year) at country level is clearly and preponderantly positive, even if a number of challenges remain to be fully addressed in regard to each of the 'Four Ones'. We note that this view is shared by the large and growing number of developing countries which are applying the Delivering as One approach and pro-actively moving towards implementing the consensus TCPR resolution (62/208). They state that important principles are in fact being observed in practice, including National Ownership and Leadership and 'No One Size Fits All'. Through the 'Delivering as One' approach UN Country Team activities are being aligned to an unprecedented degree with the national development strategies and policies of the developing countries concerned. Assistance is being delivered with greater effectiveness, savings are being realised and greater reductions in transaction costs are clearly in prospect.

148. At the same time the picture that emerges at present is interim in nature since the independent evaluation of 'Delivering as One', as foreseen by the 2007 TCPR, will come only towards the end of 2009 and, in any event, concrete development outputs arising from a new way of doing business take longer than eighteen months to emerge definitively.

149. It seems to us clear that the Assembly ought during the 62nd Session to be in a position to give a positive political impetus to 'Delivering as One', thereby giving encouragement to those many developing countries which have voluntarily embraced this approach and to enjoin the United Nations Development System to continue to pursue it. Moving forward, it will be essential to safeguard the principles underlying 'Delivering as One', inter alia, and in particular, that of enhancing national ownership and leadership in the design and implementation of UN Development System support programmes at country level. The international community should by the same token be encouraged to continue to respond positively through additional commitments where the combination of strong national leadership and an empowered UN System Country Team, delivering as one, together generate a better-aligned and more effective UN programme of support.

150. For the most part, the Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies of the System, at leadership level, have gradually become increasingly engaged with, and supportive of the 'Delivering as One' approach. The atmosphere in which they collaborate within the Chief Executives Board (CEB) under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General has been transformed for the better as they and their collaborators continue consideration of the implications of the 'four ones' at country level, viz. One Programme, One Budgetary Framework and Fund, One Leader and One Office. At the same time, it is to be recommended that Headquarters levels across the System empower the respective country level agency representatives with much greater latitude, flexibility and encouragement to advance a more coherent and therefore more effective delivery of UN System assistance on the ground in line with the 'Delivering as One' approach.

151. In all of this, the particular situations affecting middle income countries should receive adequate attention.

152. Turning to the issue of Funding in the context of System-wide Coherence, there clearly need to be greater flows of and greater predictability in funding. In general, overall commitments made solemnly and repeatedly need to be implemented more faithfully. Commendation is due to those development partners which have made concrete contributions to advancing the 'Delivering as One' approach at the country level in response to the strategies, priorities, policies and plans of the developing countries concerned. At the same time, support for 'Delivering as One' at country level must not be at the expense of core funding to agencies through their Headquarters. Overall, there needs to be a significantly improved balance between core and non-core funding. Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies should be invited, if necessary through changes in statute, rules and/or regulations, to give effect to the consensus view in the General Assembly that savings realised at country level ought to be ploughed back into programmatic development work in the countries where the savings are realised. In this and in other ways, 'Delivering as One' must deliver more.

153. As for inter-governmental Governance at the central level we have detected no palpable appetite in the General Assembly for establishing new inter-governmental bodies including the putative Sustainable Development Board, which was recommended by the High Level Panel. At the same time the emerging new realities from a growing number of developing countries applying the 'Delivering as One' approach at country level will need to be accommodated and addressed more effectively by the existing Boards and not least by ECOSOC. In light of the on-going and emerging nature of the 'Delivering as One' approach, it may be necessary to continue and deepen discussion of these issues during the 63rd Session.

154. If, in that context, the Assembly focuses firstly on the functions that need to be discharged centrally and inter-governmentally towards 'Delivering as One' it will perhaps then be easier to address the question of which institutions, as these continue to adapt, are best placed to discharge the functions in question.

155. We also believe that the UN System and the Bretton Woods Institutions ought to be consistently encouraged to develop, in a pragmatic manner, a far greater degree of cooperation and collaboration in the context described in the present report. Some progress is already being made. This needs to be developed and enlarged.

156. As for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women we recommend that the Assembly be invited to address the matter, including in light of the Secretary-General's paper on the institutional dimension in open, in informal plenary consultations at an early opportunity, perhaps in the opening days of September. During the current Session the member States have advanced together, by agreement, in their consideration of the issue of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. With assistance from the Secretary-General, they have together identified critical gaps in the way the System assists member States to implement globally agreed mandates and their own internationally-made commitments in the area of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. With further open and genuine discussion the Assembly may be in a position before the conclusion of its 62nd Session to signal in general terms, but nevertheless clearly, which institutional option or combination of options, perhaps as adjusted, it wishes to pursue. Detailed working through of such an agreed approach could then be taken up and completed in the 63rd Session. We have the very strong impression that no Government, whether for substantive or 'tactical' reasons would wish to stand in the way of a consensus to advance the issue of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment through a measured but significant step forward.

157. We believe that in light of the present report and the Secretary-General's options paper on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (in its institutional aspect) member States ought to be equipped for decision-making during the present Session. With these substantive elements in hand, member States are also better placed to weigh the format of the Assembly's decision-making.

158. In the first instance, and on the basis of the foregoing Report and these conclusions, member States may, during UNGA62, wish to address, perhaps in a package decision, the four core priority areas which they have highlighted throughout viz.

i) UN 'Delivering as One' at country level with the related aspect of Harmonisation of Business Practices;
ii) Funding;
iii) Governance; and
iv) Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

159. The same decision could signal that henceforth, in the context of inter-governmental discussion on System-wide Coherence, the Assembly will focus exclusively on these priority areas and will exclude from this context the issues of Environment/Environmental Governance; Humanitarian Assistance; and Human Rights in line with the considerations set out in the present report.

160. As Co-Chairs we will remain at the disposal of the President of the General Assembly through to the conclusion of the 62nd Session in mid-September, should he desire our input in facilitating, during the closing weeks of the Session, adoption of a decision by the Assembly along these lines.

161. In conclusion we would like to express our appreciation for the kindness and support that has been extended to us in our work as Co-Chairs by the President of the General Assembly H.E. Dr. Srgjan Kerim; by H. E. Deputy Secretary-General, Dr. Ashe Rose Migiro and by all those officials of the United Nations system in New York who greatly assisted our work. We thank the member States which have so actively participated in the broad consultation process. In particular we would like to thank the Governments of the pilots and other countries which are implementing a Coherence approach and where we were received at the highest levels, as representatives of the General Assembly. These developing countries participated in the consultations in New York to share their experiences of 'Delivering as One' at country level. We would also like to thank sincerely the Resident Coordinators and the dedicated and talented members of the United Nations Country Teams in all the countries we visited. As we have stated previously, the UN Country Teams have exhibited great professionalism in designing and now implementing the UN reforms at country level, a task that has placed great demands on these officials – since their respective Headquarters too often expect them at the same time, with little or no acknowledgement of the increased burden on them, to continue to implement in every detail the paradigm that has obtained hitherto. Thus they are called upon to operate two paradigms simultaneously. We believe that the membership will be extremely grateful to them for the commitment they have shown to the United Nations. We would like to thank the Heads of the UN Funds, Programmes and Specialised Agencies who have been so active in this consultation process. Their openness and frankness about the challenges which remain and their commitment to resolving these challenges in a collegial manner, to strengthen the System as a whole for the benefit of the people whom they all serve, is at the core of this process. We also thank the senior management of the Bretton Woods Institutions who received us in Washington D.C. Finally, we thank our own hard-working Irish and Tanzanian collaborators and colleagues as well as all others who have helped and encouraged us over the past six months.

162. It is a great honour for us both and for our countries, Ireland and the United Republic of Tanzania, to have been requested to act as Co-Chairs on this crucially important area of UN reform. For this we are deeply grateful.

Ambassador Augustine Mahiga
Permanent Representative of the
United Republic of Tanzania

Ambassador Paul Kavanagh
Permanent Representative
Ireland

21 July 2008